

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/759,877

Applicant(s)

BOYLAND ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey Sharp

Art Unit

3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey Sharp.

(3) Wai Tong.

(2) James Hwa.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 March 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Motor housing assembled with end cover and hook nuts.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims of Record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

3/13/07

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: This interview was granted after final rejection. Examiner informed Applicant that any changes to the claims would require further consideration and/or search. Examiner also informed Applicant that no proper decisions on patentability can be made at this time, since prosecution is closed at the time of interview. Applicant was given the opportunity to discuss the invention background, discuss any proposed claims, and comment on the final rejection mailed 18 December 2006. Examiner made suggestions that might move prosecution forward. Discussion of possible "motor usage" language to independent claim 26. Discussion of possibly incorporating the motor structure and end cover structure of claim 29 into independent claims.